

REMARKS

Allowance of Claims

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's allowance of Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-18 and 33-62.

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner also states that Claims 69 and 71 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As explained below, Applicants have amended independent Claims 2 and 20 to include all of the limitations of Claims 68-71. Therefore, independent Claims 2 and 20 should now be in an allowable condition.

As Applicants are merely amending the claims to include previously examined allowable subject matter, it is respectfully requested that this amendment be entered and allowed.

Applicants will now address the Examiner's remaining rejections in depth in the order in which they appear in the Final Rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Cok in view of Bell and Greeneich

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner rejects Claims 2, 20, 25, 26, 31, 32 and 65 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cok (US 6,636,191) in view of Bell (US 4,996,523) and Greeneich et al. (US 4,110,662). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In particular, with respect to independent Claims 2 and 20, the Examiner contends that Cok discloses all the limitations of these claims except for claimed n memories and means for determining a length of a period of a light emitting element. The Examiner cites Bell and Greeneich for alleging curing the deficiencies in Cok and contends that Bell discloses n memories and that Greeneich discloses means for determining a length of a period of a light emitting element. Applicants respectfully disagree.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claims 2 and 20 to recite the features of “n first thin film transistors”, “n second thin film transistors” and “wherein a gate electrode of each of n first thin film transistors is connected to each of gate signal lines and a gate electrode of each of n second thin film transistors is connected to a latch signal line.”

As mentioned above, these features are based on the subject matter of dependent claims 68-71 (which have now been canceled), which the Examiner stated included allowable subject matter.

Applicants note that the present application discloses, in for example Fig. 1, “n first thin film transistors” (101-1...), “n second thin film transistors” (103-1...), “wherein a gate electrode of each of n first thin film transistors is connected to each of gate signal lines” (Gj-1...) and “a gate electrode of each of n second thin film transistors is connected to a latch signal line” (LATj).

As the Examiner admits, the cited references do not disclose or suggest these new claimed features of independent Claims 2 and 20.

Accordingly, independent Claims 2 and 20 and those claimed dependent thereon are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references and are patentable thereover. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Takeda et al. in view of Bell and Stewart

The Examiner also rejects Claims 20, 25, and 26 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Takeda et al. (US 4,651,149) in view of Bell and Stewart (US 5,302,966). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

More specifically, with regard to independent Claim 20, the Examiner contends that Takeda discloses all the limitations of this claim except for claimed n memories and means for determining a length of a period of a light emitting element. The Examiner then contends that Bell discloses n memories and that Stewart discloses means for determining a length of a period of a light emitting element which allegedly cures the deficiencies in Takeda. Applicants respectfully disagree.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants have amended independent Claim 20 as discussed above.

Accordingly, as the Examiner admits that the cited references do not disclose or suggest these new claimed features of independent Claim 20, independent Claim 20 and those claims dependent thereon are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references and are patentable thereover. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Legagneux et al. in view of Bell and Greeneich

The Examiner also rejects Claims 2, 31, 32, 65 and 68 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Legagneux et al. (US 6,356,028) in view of Bell and Greeneich. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

More specifically, with regard to independent Claim 2, the Examiner contends that Legagneux discloses all the limitations of this claim except for claimed n memories and means for determining a length of a period of a light emitting element. The Examiner then contends that Bell discloses n memories and Greeneich discloses means for determining a length of a period of a light emitting element which allegedly cures the deficiencies in Legagneux. Applicants respectfully disagree.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants have amended independent Claim 2 as discussed above.

Accordingly, as the Examiner admits that the cited references do not disclose or suggest these new claimed features of independent Claim 2, independent Claim 2 and those claims dependent thereon are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references and are patentable thereover. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Legagneux et al. in view of Bell and Greeneich and Takeda

The Examiner also rejects Claims 20, 25, 26 and 70 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Legagneux et al. in view of Bell, Greeneich and Takeda. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

With regard to independent Claim 20, the Examiner contends that Legagneux discloses all the limitations of this claim except for claimed n memories and LCD display. The Examiner contends that Bell discloses n memories and that Takeda discloses a LCD display which allegedly cures the deficiencies in Legagneux. Applicants respectfully disagree.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants have amended independent Claim 20 as discussed above.

Accordingly, as the Examiner admits that the cited references do not disclose or suggest these new claimed features of independent Claim 20, independent Claim 20 and those claims dependent thereon are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references and are patentable thereover. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants filed an information disclosure statement (IDS) on September 13, 2006 (received by the Patent Office on September 18, 2006). It is respectfully requested that this IDS be entered and considered prior to the issuance of any further action on this application.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee is due for this amendment, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 22, 2006

/Mark J. Murphy/
Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.
200 West Adams Street
Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568